(1)

Case 2:22-cv-00082-CDS-DJA Document 30-1 Filed 10/04/22 Page 1 of 3

Plaintiff has shown good cause for the motion to be granted however this court seems to keeps focusing and ruling in its orders that since defendants motions were denied that somehow this makes plaintiff motion for an extention to file his answer moot. What the court keeps failing to address for the record is that defendant attorney Taylor Simpson, alleged claims and alligations were going to be addressed by plaintiff providing the documents. I am sure his client Tako LLC, never told him about the facts and details otherwise he would have not made them inaccurrate statement about the plaintiff in his filing of motions because he has no clues of what has taken place. Plaintiff felt the need to address them since defendants attorney was attempting to attack his charactor.

The court has never addressed plaintiff requesting an extention based off of his (5) pending cases which (3) are in the same federal courthouse as this case. The court keeps over looking this fact and this is the main fact fact and issue plaintiff made his request in the first place not to simply respond to defendants false claims.

However this court keeps advoiding that plaintiff has multiple cases pending and has shown good casuse for an extention to allow to properly file his answer. The court keeps ignoring this fact. Plaintiff believes if the defense attorney requested an extention this court would have granted it and the defense would not have to point out the court keeps relying on the fact that defendant motion was denied therefore no response is needed.

However the court keeps failing to address the (5) pending cases that plaintiff has pending as grounds to grant his motion for an extention to file his answer thus this shows further bias by the court and fairness.

Plaintiff is requesting that the court state why it keeps refussing to grant plaintiff motion to grant an extention to file his answer, also to state why the court in continuing denying plaintiff request it never states or addresses plaintiff other (5) pending cases as a bases to grant or deny plaintiff motion the court only states that defendant motion was denied. So plaintiff motion to request an extention moot it is not moot plaintiff needs the time to prepare his answer to this courts order by October 12, 2022 or the court has stated it will dismiss plaintiff case without further notice. Plaintiff needs the time to prepare his answer.

JIIIIIII

///////

RELIEF REQUESTED

Plaintiff Colvin, has demonstrated to the court the need and urgency to be granted an extention of time to file his answer. Deying plaintiff the most common request made in legal proceedings his to deny plaintiff due process of the law. Plaintiff has a case pending in this courthouse and his attorney has had multiple extentions granted for things like my attorney was going to be out of town and needs more time to prepare to file answers to motions and court orders. The defendants have also requests for an extention and the court has granted every one. Plaintiff request is just as important as the attorneys that file for an extentions and get them granted all the time thus again is requesting for an extention to file his answer.

DATED AND SUBMITTED THIS DAY SEPTEMBER 30, 2022

PARNELL COLVIN